UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/632,561	07/31/2003	Jaime E. Garcia	JK01243	2593	
28268 The black A	7590 10/03/2007 & DECKER CORPORA		EXAMINER		
701 EAST JOPPA ROAD, TW199			DEXTER, CLARK F		
TOWSON, MI	D 21286		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3724	,	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•	10/632,561	GARCIA ET AL.	GARCIA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Clark F. Dexter	3724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication		1 1	ess			
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tatute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this comm. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6	02 August 2007.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for all	•	•	nerits is			
closed in accordance with the practice und	ler <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 21-25 and 35-41 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ⊠ Claim(s) 21-25 is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 35 and 36 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 37-41 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers	·					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.	•				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to	= : : · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	` '				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			•			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have beer reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National St	age 			
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of 6) Other:	Informal Patent Application				

Art Unit: 3724

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 2, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35

Art Unit: 3724

U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsiung, pn 6,481,322.

Hsiung discloses a saw with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention including:

a support surface with an aperture (e.g., 14) extending therethrough for supporting a workpiece;

a beveling cutting device (e.g., 11, 12) adjustably extending through the support surface aperture, said cutting device for cutting a workpiece, the cutting device being disposed in a plane and having a perimeter (e.g., the outer boundaries of 11, 12), the cutting device having a rotational axis within the perimeter of the cutting device, and a beveling axis substantially perpendicular to the rotational axis, whereby operation of the cutting device in the workpiece results in the formation of a kerf having a first and a second side in the workpiece;

a first optical emitting device (e.g., 3) adjustably coupled to the table saw and disposed above the support surface to project a first optical indicator substantially aligned with the plane;

wherein the first optical emitting device is configured so as to bevel with the cutting device, such that said first optical indicator is projected to substantially indicate a cutting path of the cutting device along the workpiece;

Art Unit: 3724

[claim 36] wherein the first optical emitting device adjustably coupled to the table saw (e.g., see Fig. 1) to project a first optical indicator substantially aligned with the first side of the kerf.

Hsiung lacks the cutting device having the rotational axis disposed below the support surface. However, such rotational support configurations are old and well known in the art and provide various well known benefits including a larger arc of rotation to provide the desired angle of attack and the desired cutting path through a workpiece. Examples of such a rotational support configuration are present in a variety of configurations; for example, Blanckensee, Kleeb et al., Lewis, Else, and McEwan et al. each discloses such a configuration to provide various benefits including a configuration to accommodate an automatic actuation device for moving the saw through the cutting motion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide such a rotational support configuration on the saw of Hsiung to gain the well known benefits including those described above.

Further, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Hsiung by providing the rotational axis at, above or below the support surface since applicant has not disclosed that having the rotational axis at a specific location (i.e., below the support surface) solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose, and it appears that the saw would perform equally well with the rotational axis disposed at any vertical location relative to the support surface.

Art Unit: 3724

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 21-25 are allowable over the prior art of record.

5. Claims 37-41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed January 22, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive at least for the reasons previously presented. It is noted that the added limitations are broad and thus the claim still reads substantially on the prior art as described in the prior art rejection above.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark F. Dexter whose telephone number is (571)272-4505. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on (571)272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 5

Art Unit: 3724

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Clark F. Dexter Primary Examiner Art Unit 3724

cfd October 1, 2007